

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 93 19:19:24 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #337  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Wed, 17 Mar 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    337

Today's Topics:

    "Real Future of Ham Radio" (Was: FL hams...tower, stop Xmitting)  
        75 Ohm Hardline, How to Use? (2 msgs)  
            Crystal Oscillator Info?  
            Dayton Hamvention Information  
    DESPERATE...NEED TO KNOW FACTS CONCERNING LEGALITY  
        Ham only dual-bander HT?  
        Ham Radio Outlet incident  
        Help on mod to GE Custom Executive  
        Motorola Radios Are/Were Tough  
        Question about MODE on QSL cards  
    What about those FAQing number stations anyway?  
        Yaesu FT-530 vs. TH-28A

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 17 Mar 93 17:18:06 GMT  
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!usenet.coe.montana.edu!  
ogicse!flop.ENGR.ORST.EDU!gaia.ucs.orst.edu!umn.edu!kksys.com!edgar!brainiac!  
moron!pillock!stevej@sdd.hp.com  
Subject: "Real Future of Ham Radio" (Was: FL hams...tower, stop Xmitting)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

sharon@world.std.com (Sharon M Gartenberg) writes:

> There was a request for more information about the case of two Florida  
> hams who were ordered by a county judge to take down their antenna tower.

> the plaintiffs (7 households), Judge Charles E. Smith of the 19th Judicial  
> Circuit in and for Indian River county, FL, found the radio transmissions  
> to be a noxious and offensive activity, and the appearance of the tower and  
> antennas an annoyance and nuisance to the neighborhood. ``This large, tall  
...  
> There is a fear that if the Browers' appeal is unsuccessful, it will set a  
> dangerous precedent for any ham whose neighbors don't like the way their  
> antennas look and complain about interference to consumer electronics. Like  
> the Browers, the hams could be ordered to remove their towers and cease  
> all radio transmissions.

This particular message started to make me think about the "Real Future of Ham Radio" in the USA. I could be sorry I started this thread and I could be opening a Pandora's (sp?) box but here we go.

As technology has progressed faster and faster, we seem to be coming under a greater pressure from commercial entities that want our spectrum for new technologies (as shown by the infamous 220mhz grab and failed ACSSB use.) and by the "annoyance factor" as shown above. It appears that although our future is not totally bleak, we may be in for some rough times ahead. While I am not a doom and gloom proponent, I do believe in "Being Prepared".

\*\*\*The following is for example only, please keep discussion to topic\*\*\*  
A semi-related example is that those of us who like to hunt are finding it increasingly difficult to find public hunting lands for a variety of reasons. We are now increasingly forced to buy land to secure our sport.

\*\*\*The above was for example only, please keep discussion to topic\*\*\*

If the government releases 200mhz of space, this is still a finite amount of space and where will they look to next for more frequencies for commercial entities, especially if the new technologies appear to obsolete the need for our emergency communications in the government's eyes.

The question then is:

Should we as collective individuals and/or the ARRL bid for some of these frequencies that will be auctioned off, especially if any are auctioned off in blocks? (ie. continuous 1mhz block)

If the abolition of ham radio as a public entity should come about then the continuation of ham radio as a private entity will already be installed.

One last thought, would we bill the government for emergency use of our private frequencies. :-)

Oh Well, we can always take over GMRS. :-) ;-)

Steve KA0VYB

-----  
Date: 17 Mar 93 22:34:52 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: 75 Ohm Hardline, How to Use?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Al, N1AL says:  
>.....(3/4 wave is an odd multiple of 1/4 wave.)

Huh? 3/4 wave is an odd multiple, as is 1/4, etc. But since 3/4 is a half-wave multiple of 1/4, then it's an even multiple of 1/4 wave.

73,  
Dube AB5AP <dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com>

-----  
Date: Wed, 17 Mar 1993 23:39:31 GMT  
From: swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 75 Ohm Hardline, How to Use?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <199303172234.AA29437@tilde.csc.ti.com> dube@cpdvax.CSc.ti.COM writes:

>Al, N1AL says:  
>>.....(3/4 wave is an odd multiple of 1/4 wave.)  
>  
>Huh? 3/4 wave is an odd multiple, as is 1/4, etc. But since 3/4 is a  
>half-wave multiple of 1/4, then it's an even multiple of 1/4 wave.

Huh?

Wavelength	Multiplier	Order
1/4	1	fundamental
2/4	2	even
3/4	3	odd

Gary

--  
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary  
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary  
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary  
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 17 Mar 1993 23:36:50 GMT  
From: swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Crystal Oscillator Info?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <Mar17.185448.55908@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>  
gw214790@longs.LANCE.ColoState.Edu (Galen Watts) writes:  
>I'm trying to build a crystal oscillator using cheap microprocessor  
>crystals. I can get a crystal that is half the frequency I want, but  
>I can't find any books that have doubling oscillators in them. Anybody  
>out there know of such books?  
>  
>I looked into a hybrid sine oscillator module, but it would magnify the  
>cost of my project by about 10 times.

The Handbook to the rescue one more time. :-)  
What you want is a Pierce oscillator with a tuned drain. Tune the drain  
to 2X the crystal frequency. It won't be clean, and it won't be strong,  
tripling is easier than doubling. But it will work for a quick and  
dirty circuit. Better would be to use a Colpitts oscillator followed  
by a push pull doubler stage. This will be strong and clean as well as  
offering buffering to the oscillator.

Gary

--  
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary  
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary  
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary  
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

-----  
Date: Wed, 17 Mar 1993 20:13:35 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!news.cs.indiana.edu!  
babbage.ece.uc.edu!ucunix.san.uc.edu!morris@network  
Subject: Dayton Hamvention Information  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

BTW, my buddy and I got our acceptance/rejection (respectively) for flea  
market spaces in the mail yesterday (Tuesday 17Mar93). If you were in  
the "lottery" for flea mkt tix, look for the envelope in the mail over  
the next day or two...

Ted Morris WB8VNV  
morris@ucunix.san.uc.edu

-----  
Date: 17 Mar 93 00:32:51 EST  
From: rit!isc-newsserver!psinnntp!psinnntp!arrl.org@cs.rochester.edu  
Subject: DESPERATE...NEED TO KNOW FACTS CONCERNING LEGALITY  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:

>  
>Yes, when the owner of the HT has no intentions of making or purchasing a  
>1.3G transverter ... Who in is right mind would go to the trouble of making  
>or purchasing a 1.3G transverter and use a chintsy FM HT as the signal source  
>really boggles the mind ...  
>  
>Try something a bit more reasonable Chuck ... :-}

I wish more people would try using FM HTs on microwaves. Sure, it doesn't work as well as CW between skilled operators, but who says you have to use microwaves on difficult paths? I've had numerous contacts of up to 80 miles where FM would have worked just as well. Actually better, since there more tolerance of frequency drift. The USB/LSB problem also goes away.

I find that 142 MHz makes a nice IF for a 222 MHz transverter. It is easier to filter out the 3rd harmonic of the LO than if you used a 144 MHz IF. It should work for 432, though I haven't built the hardware.

Surplus microwave oscillators often have crystals in them that might be usable if your IF out of the amateur bands. Not only is it cheaper, but crystals do seem to get better with age (frequency stability). Thus, the old one often works better than a new one. Different IFs are recommended for experimental work--it makes it easier to determine that you are indeed making a contact on the frequency you think you are operating.

Finally, if you want to be cautious, get a scanner directory and find out if anyone is using your IF before you go to that hilltop. You might even check out the known/possible spurious products to prevent potential problems.

Zack Lau KH6CP/1

Internet: zlau@arrl.org	"Working" on 24 GHz SSB/CW gear
	Operating Interests: 10 GHz CW/SSB/FM
US Mail: c/o ARRL Lab	80/40/20 CW
225 Main Street	Station capability: QRP, 1.8 MHz to 10 GHz
Newington CT 06111	modes: CW/SSB/FM/packet

amtor/baudot

Phone (if you really have to): 203-666-1541

-----  
Date: Tue, 16 Mar 93 20:49:16 GMT

From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!slcs.slb.com!leo.asc.slb.com!sjasca4!  
jones@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Ham only dual-bander HT?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:

: In article <1993Mar9.195228.25420@sj.ate.slb.com> jones@sj.ate.slb.com (Clark  
Jones) writes:

: [in repsonse to this lament]

: >: 3) With wide band receive (which is a bug, not a feature), there is increased

: >: intermod. You can hear a lot more, but you hear it badly. Why not

: >: simply buy a scanner if that is your heart's desire?

: >

: >Because that's one more piece of junk to lug around. I've got enough stuff

: >to carry around as it is. Besides, the use of CTCSS encoding on the output

: >of repeaters, which allows me to use "tone squelch" on my radio, cuts out

: >most of the intermod problems at my end in my radio on the ham bands.

: >(Unluckily, it doesn't do anything for the pagers and other stuff interfering

: >with my reception of the NOAA broadcast, but that isn't worth while to carry

: >a separate radio.) Also, all of the HT's I've seen at least appear to be

: >more ruggedly constructed than \_any\_ scanner I've ever seen.

:

: Outbound CTCSS is a help, but it's not a full solution. Intermod can

: prevent the decoding of the CTCSS and/or it can still interfere with

: the desired signal adding heterodyne like squalling and sometimes direct

: mixes in your receiver with the desired signal, causing audibility of

: undesired voices and paging tones directly on channel.

I agree that CTCSS is by no means a full solution. It does nothing to improve reception of wanted signals, but it sure does cut down on unwanted signals. And since the repeaters that I listen to, at the times I listen to them, are quiet maybe 95% of the time, CTCSS is "sufficient", at least for the present. (Getting the commercial (ab)users that operate pagers, et al, ad nauseum, to adhere to good engineering standards would help more. Around here, the "annual inspections" of mountain top repeaters generally find the "amateur" ones passing with flying colors, but the "commercial" folks getting dinged for all sorts of infractions, especially lack of isolators.)

:Strong out of band

: signals can also do direct desense on your receiver, preventing it from

: copying the desired signal at all. This is a serious deficit of wideband HTs.

: Radio Shack, of all people, did it right with their HT. It's narrow  
: frontend is nearly immune to these problems. Now if they only made  
: a dualbander with similar properties. The only radio that comes  
: close is the Icom 32AT. In the commercial two way field, both Motorola  
: and GE HTs are bullet proof. Not only do they use helical front end  
: filtering, but they are mechanically rugged as well.

I've not had much experience with the commercial HT's, but the commercial  
mobile radios make excellent repeaters when converted, not in the least due  
to the narrow front ends.

:All they lack to  
: be ideal ham radios is to be tuneable across the band.

Uh, which do you want: super narrow front end, or tuneable? You can't have  
both in the size and weight of a reasonable HT.

:If you only  
: need a few frequencies, they're ideal as is. My ideal radio would  
: be as simple to use as an IC2AT with the electrical and mechanical  
: ruggedness of a GE Mastr series HT. I don't want scanning or memories

The scanning can come in handy when in a new area for which you don't  
have a reliable repeater directory. I've done this: scan the 2M band  
looking for repeaters, or scan a series of repeaters looking for interesting  
ones, upon arrival in a new area.

As for the memories, consider the Zia link: 11 linked repeaters in three  
states using a total of 9 different frequencies. I don't know about you,  
but I'm not into trying to memories that many frequencies, or trying to  
punch them in while driving. (Due to financial considerations, my HT has  
to do double duty as a mobile rig, and it gives satisfactory performance.)

Also, I travel frequently in my job (usually by commercial airlines) to the  
mostly the same set of cities. Trying to remember sets of frequencies like  
that becomes a bit difficult. Easier to remember that memories 0 to 10 are  
home, 11 to 15 are San Jose, 16 to 20 are Albuquerque. (Especially when  
the same frequency repeaters need different CTCSS tones in different cities.)

: or the ability to emulate a Gameboy.

I have no need of it emulating a Gameboy, either! ;-) ;-) ;-)

: I just want a radio that works  
: under extreme conditions. A radio should work in high RF fields,

I don't know about you, but I don't often hike around the "tower forest"  
of TV transmitters, nor do I make it a habit of camping directly in front

of air traffic control radar antennas. ;-) I'm willing to put up with a little interference when I'm within 100 feet of a 50KW broadcast station, as for one thing, it lets me know that maybe I should keep on going! ;-) ;-)

: and  
: it should easily survive a 6 foot drop on concrete.

I'll agree with that. (BTW, my DJ-F1T survived a 4 foot drop minutes ago.)

: Anything less is  
: unacceptable.  
:  
: Gary

I'd love to have a ham-band-only mobile rig, and a mobile scanner, and a separate NOAA monitor, etc., in my truck, if money permitted. But when I have to carry equipment when I'm on foot (including through airports), I want as little wieght as possible consistant with being reasonably rugged, and still give me the frequencies that I need/want.

Since the government wants to leave me so little of the money I'm earning, I basically had to settle for a single radio for both HT and mobile work. I've found that with the addition of the CTCSS decoder board, the DJ-F1T gives me acceptable perfomance under the vast majority of situations.

Having never met you in person, Gary, may I ask if you are similar in build to Arnold Schwarzeneger (sp?)? If so, then I can see how you might not mind carrying several radios around. I, on the other hand, am lucky to be able to carry around a single radio, considering my physical handicap.

Clark

--

Disclaimer: The opinions expressed above are mine and not those of Schlumberger because they are NOT covered by the patent agreement!

Phone: (602) 345-3638 RF: N7RPQ  
Snail: Clark Jones, Schlumberger Technologies, 7855 S. River Pkwy #116, Tempe,  
AZ 85284-1825

-----

Date: Tue, 16 Mar 93 21:20:37 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!slcs.slb.com!leo.asc.slb.com!sjsca4!  
jones@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Ham Radio Outlet incident  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu



Seth Taylor (taylor@tix.timeplex.COM) wrote:

: If HRO had a retail facility in NY (state) or NJ they would be  
: required by law to clearly display the price of \*every\* item on  
: display for sale and or have every item idividually marked. Retail  
: stores in our area (NJ) have been cited and told to clean up their  
: act or risk substantial fines. I wonder if California has similar  
: requirements ? Even if the items area scanned for the UPC code to  
: determine the price at the checkout, prices have to be clearly  
: displayed by law. Sounds like HRO is a less than honest and/or  
: law abiding operation.

:

: Seth KC2WE

Arizona has such a law (per the letter of the law, every ITEM must be priced,  
but per enforcement, a tag on the self is sufficient, due to the bar-coding  
[UPC] arrangements).

The Phoenix HRO \_DOES\_ abide by the (enforced version) of the law, i.e.,  
they have tags on/below/beside every radio, and on every "out front" "small"  
item. (The behind-the-counter items [for instance, speaker mikes, mike  
connectors, rubber ducky antennas, etc] are exempt from both the law and  
the local HRO practice.)

By the way, I had been in there a couple of times several years ago,  
and they weren't obeying the law back then, but have been since before  
I got my ticket. In talking to some friends, their tagging everything  
has made them much more popular with the local ham community.

Clark

--

Disclaimer: The opinions expressed above are mine and not those of Schlumberger  
because they are NOT covered by the patent agreement!

Phone: (602) 345-3638

RF: N7RPQ

Snail: Clark Jones, Schlumberger Technologies, 7855 S. River Pkwy #116, Tempe,  
AZ 85284-1825

-----  
Date: 17 Mar 1993 23:19:41 GMT

From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!swrinde!gatech!concert!

lester.appstate.edu!lester.appstate.edu!usenet@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Help on mod to GE Custom Executive

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I have a General Electric Custom Executive which is an all solid state  
radio and is a fairly large underdash radio (i.e. controls for vol,

squelch, channel select and the microphone are on the radio). Model number is RC56FAS66 and it presently is on 154 mhz. Anyone have an experience in getting such a radio down to 145 mhz.? Apparently the radio was part of the Mastr series, but it is not a Mastr Pro or Royal Custom, and I have only ever seen one other radio like it in about 25 years around 2-way radios and going to hamfests.

Any help in modifying this down to 145 mhz will be appreciated.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Marv Hoffman, KD4EGV  
Appalachian State University  
Boone, N.C.

Bitnet: HOFFMANMK@APPSTATE.BITNET  
Internet: HOFFMANMK@CONRAD.APPSTATE.EDU

-----  
Date: Wed, 17 Mar 93 01:56:09 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!slcs.slb.com!leo.asc.slb.com!sjsca4!jones@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Motorola Radios Are/Were Tough  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Richard Hosker (RPH0470@tntech.EDU) wrote:  
: I've also seen a Motorola HT used as a hammer to open a stuck  
: padlock--didn't seem to affect it a bit. (The radio, not the lock. The lock  
: was beaten to scrap metal by the time it came open.)  
:  
: 'Course, for what Motorola charges, their gear \*ought\* to last forever...:-/

When I started shopping for my HT a couple of years ago, I was very disappointed to find that Motorola doesn't seem to realize that Ham Radio is a viable market... too bad that somebody like the ailing Government Products Division doesn't think to try to adapt the Motorola HT technology to the Ham bands. I think some of their HT's already have DTMF pads, so all that would be necessary is changing from a xtal control to a synthesizer. (As for CTCSS, well, Moto invented PL! ;-)

--  
Disclaimer: The opinions expressed above are mine and not those of Schlumberger because they are NOT covered by the patent agreement!

Phone: (602) 345-3638 RF: N7RPQ  
Snail: Clark Jones, Schlumberger Technologies, 7855 S. River Pkwy #116, Tempe,  
AZ 85284-1825

-----  
Date: 17 Mar 93 13:55:35 EDT  
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!utcsri!newsflash.concordia.ca!  
nsth.na!psinnth!psinnth!arrrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Question about MODE on QSL cards  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>>I had never had anyone mention that I should be filling out cards  
>>like this. I grabbed my ARRL operating manual tonight and took a  
>>quick look at the section on QSLing and awards. I didn't see  
>>mention that you should clearly indicate that this was a 2 way  
>>contact. But it could be there as I didn't take time to study this  
>>carefully -- though I did read it reasonably well when I first

It's in the ARRL Operating Manual quite clearly. Page 3-25:

"Leave no doubt that the QSL is confirming a two-way contact  
by using language such as 'confirming two-way QSO with,' .....  
before the other station's call"

If amateurs would recall, now and then, what the term "QSL"  
actually means, this problem wouldn't crop up.

			Deputy Manager, Field Services, ARRL.
		---	The ARRL Amateur Radio Emergency Service, the ARRL
	uck		urder
-----			National Traffic System, The Amateur Auxiliary to
			the FCC's Field Operations Bureau, the ARRL
	KY1T		Field Organization and the ARRL Monitoring System.

-----  
lhurder@arrrl.org Prodigy - MGTS39A, BIX - ARRL,  
MCI Mail - RPALM, MCI Mail - "ARRL", America On Line - "ARRL HQ"  
Compuserve - 70007,3373 (ARRL HQ) -- Genie ARRL.HQ

-----  
Date: 17 Mar 93 22:02:26 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: What about those FAQing number stations anyway?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> Possibly for the same reason the American Military says "niner"  
> instead of nine. I spent 15 years in the Army most of it in  
> the Signal Corps. And I still don't know why!!

I heard its origin was in WWI. The german word for zero is "nine".  
Niner distinguishes the english number from the german one.

--

Leonard Rosenblum       INTERNET: rosenblu@drone.hazeltine.com

-----

Date: 17 Mar 1993 22:56:13 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!  
uclink.berkeley.edu!acollins@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Yaesu FT-530 vs. TH-28A  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C41pnJ.31G@fc.hp.com> paulc@fc.hp.com (Paul Christofanelli) writes:  
>Jack Hamilton (jfh@netcom.com) wrote:

>:

>: Is there any 2m/440 HT that doesn't have those problems?

>:

>

>Hmmm, good point. Haven't heard of any clear winners in the dual-band  
>arena, but I wouldn't call myself very knowledgeable, especially when it  
>comes to Standard or even Alinco. Someone mentioned that the 530's  
>predecessor, the FT-470 was decent for a dual-bander. It seems like the  
>relation is currently: Spurious Signal Sensitivity is directly  
>proportional to Wideband Receive Sensitivity. The FT-470 sensitivity  
>dropped pretty quickly out-of-band.

Yes, as a proud owner of said article, I can attest. Although I've never  
really used any other models, I have not had any significant problems with  
intermod or spurious signal response inside the ham bands. (I do hear  
all sorts of weirdness as I exceed the units extended receive range, i.e.  
I once listened to what I know has a strong local repeater with the VFO  
set at ~135 mhz, its one of the rigs ways of telling you you've gone too  
far) Compared to many other units (I have listened to a friends IC-W2A,  
and he has had serious intermod problems) the 470 seems to have good  
intermod resistance coupled with the reletively small receive coverage,  
as you pointed out. My experience has been that the usable receive coverage  
is about 138-170 or so on VHF and 420-470 or so on UHF.

>How about an internal bandpass filter that's switched in when you're in  
>the ham bands and switched out otherwise? Might not add much to the  
>cost of these rigs and would make them much more usable in urban  
>environments. Or, on those HT amplifiers, substituting a bandpass  
>filter that can be switched in or out for the pre-amp that many of them  
>have...

I don't believe the 470 has such a pre-amp, but I don't know about any

other brands or models. The idea of having two front ends, one optimized for scanning and one for ham-band receiving is definately intriguing. What I would love to see, although I don't think the state of the art is there yet, nor would I want to contemplate the price, would be a totally digital setup, i.e. the "front-end" becomes an extremely high-frequency sampler, and all processing is done in software, with some form of optimized RISC processor doing the processing. This would allow you to dial in a filter charateristic, and maintain it across enormous bandwidth, not to mention the ability to make the thing receive essentially any mode you want. I have no idea how much of this can be done with today's DSPs, but I suspect that doing it in software this way is the way of the future.

Anybody got any ideas or thoughts (maybe it's time to start another thread on this if anyone's got any more ideas)

Andy Collins, KC6YFY  
acollins@uclink.berkeley.edu

-----  
Date: Wed, 17 Mar 1993 22:58:17 GMT  
From: usc!wupost!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar15.164229.18342@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>, <C40B09.8Gn@fc.hp.com>, <1993Mar17.163740.25018@netcom.com>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: Yaesu FT-530 vs. TH-28A

In article <1993Mar17.163740.25018@netcom.com> jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:

>paulc@fc.hp.com (Paul Christofanelli) wrote:  
>> closer to 50 dollars. I like the ergonomics of the 530 and wouldn't  
>> trade although I'm sure one could be happy with either, unless you  
>> really want the alpha labeling (get the TH-78), or DON'T like the  
>> spurious signal problems (don't get either one).  
>  
>Is there any 2m/440 HT that doesn't have those problems?

Short answer, not anymore. The IC32AT was pretty good about resisting intermod, but it's no longer made. If you find a used one, grab it with both hands. It'll take both hands, it's a big radio. :-)

Gary

--  
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary  
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary

534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #337  
\*\*\*\*\*